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What is ICANN?

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is a global multistakeholder, private sector-led organization that manages Internet resources for the public benefit.

- ICANN coordinates the top-level of the Internet's system of unique identifiers via global, multistakeholder, bottom-up consensus policy processes, with the outcome of those processes implemented via the IANA Functions.
What are the IANA Functions?

The IANA Functions evolved in support of the Internet Engineering Task Force, and initially funded via research projects supported by the U. S. Department of Defense, Advance Research Projects Agency.

These functions include:

- The coordination of the assignment of technical Internet protocol parameters
- The administration of certain responsibilities associated with Internet DNS Root zone management
- The allocation of Internet IP addresses

ICANN was created to perform the IANA Functions and has done so pursuant to a no-cost contract with the Department of Commerce for more than 15 years.
The IANA Functions

Internet Assigned Numbers Authority

The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) is responsible for the global coordination of the DNS Root, IP addressing, and other Internet protocol resources. Learn more.

Domain Names
IANA manages the DNS Root Zone (assignments of ccTLDs and gTLDs) along with other functions such as the .int and .arpa zones.
- Root Zone Management
- Database of Top Level Domains
- .int Registry
- .arpa Registry
- IDN Practices Repository

Number Resources
IANA coordinates allocations from the global IP and AS number spaces, such as those made to Regional Internet Registries.
- IP Addresses & AS Numbers
- Network abuse information

Protocol Assignments
IANA is the central repository for protocol name and number registries used in many Internet protocols.
- Protocol Registries
- Apply for an assignment
- Time Zone Database
## Protocol Registries

IANA is responsible for maintaining many of the codes and numbers contained in a variety of internet protocols, enumerated below. We provide this service in coordination with the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).

For more information on how to create registries, please see RFC 5226, Section 4. This document also covers the requirements for IANA Considerations in RPCs.

To view the various protocol registries, just click on their titles. To apply to modify a registry, use the relevant form. The qualifications for changing a protocol vary depending on the governing standards documents.

For information about the oversight coordination of protocol parameters, please see the IETF Protocols Registries Oversight Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol/Registry</th>
<th>A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Node Control Protocol (ANCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Capability Types</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Command Codes</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Message Types</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Port Management Functions</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Result Codes</td>
<td>RFC 6320 0x0-0xFFFF: IETF Review. 0x1000-0xFFFFFFFF: Specification Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP Technology Types</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Expert Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP TLV Types</td>
<td>RFC 6320 0x0000-0x1FFF: IETF Review. 0x2000-0xFFFF: Specification Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint GMP / ANCP Version Registry</td>
<td>RFC 6320 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc On Demand Distance Vector (AODV) Parameters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AODV Extension Types</td>
<td>RFC 3561 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AODV Message Types (for messages sent to port 654)</td>
<td>RFC 3561 Standards Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Family Numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IANA Functions

Number Resources

IANA is responsible for global coordination of the Internet Protocol addressing systems, as well as the Autonomous System Numbers used for routing Internet traffic.

Currently there are two types of Internet Protocol (IP) addresses in active use: IP version 4 (IPv4) and IP version 6 (IPv6). IPv4 was initially deployed on 1 January 1983 and is still the most commonly used version. IPv4 addresses are 32-bit numbers often expressed as 4 octets in “dotted decimal” notation (for example, 192.0.2.58). Deployment of the IPv6 protocol began in 1999. IPv6 addresses are 128-bit numbers and are conventionally expressed using hexadecimal strings (for example, 2001:0db8:85a3:0000:0000:8a2e:0370:7334).

Both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses are generally assigned in a hierarchical manner. Users are assigned IP addresses by Internet service providers (ISPs). ISPs obtain allocations of IP addresses from a local Internet registry (LIR) or National Internet Registry (NIR), or from their appropriate Regional Internet Registry (RIR):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry</th>
<th>Area Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRINIC</td>
<td>Africa Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNIC</td>
<td>Asia/Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIN</td>
<td>North America Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACNIC</td>
<td>Latin America and some Caribbean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPE NCC</td>
<td>Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IANA’s role is to allocate IP addresses from the pools of unallocated addresses to the RIRs according to their needs as described by global policy and to document protocol assignments made by the IETF. When an RIR requires more IP addresses for allocation or assignment within its region, the IANA makes an additional allocation to the RIR. We do not make allocations directly to ISPs or end users except in specific circumstances, such as allocations of multicast addresses or other protocol specific needs.

IP Address Allocations

Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4)

- IPv4 Address Space
- IPv4 Multicast Address Assignments
- IPv4 Special Purpose Address Registry
- IPv4 Recovered Address Space Registry

Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)

- IPv6 Address Space
- IPv6 Global Unicast Allocations
- IPv6 Parameters (Parameters described for IPv6, including header types, action codes, etc.)
# The IANA Functions

## IANA IPv4 Address Space Registry

**Last Updated**
2015-05-11

**Registration Procedure(s)**

**Description**
The allocation of Internet Protocol version 4 (IPv4) address space to various registries is listed here. Originally, all the IPv4 address spaces were managed directly by the IANA. Later parts of the address space were allocated to various other registries to manage for particular purposes or regional areas of the world. RFC 1466 [RFC1466] documents most of these allocations.

**Reference**
[RFC7249]

### Available Formats
- CSV
- XML
- HTML
- Plain text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>WHOIS</th>
<th>RDAP</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003/8</td>
<td>IANA - Local Identification</td>
<td>1981-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESERVED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001/8</td>
<td>APNIC</td>
<td>2010-01</td>
<td>whois.apnic.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002/8</td>
<td>RIPE NCC</td>
<td>2009-09</td>
<td>whois.ripe.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003/8</td>
<td>General Electric Company</td>
<td>1994-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004/8</td>
<td>Level 3 Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>1992-12</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005/8</td>
<td>RIPE NCC</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>whois.ripe.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006/8</td>
<td>Army Information Systems Center</td>
<td>1994-02</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007/8</td>
<td>Administered by ARIN</td>
<td>1995-04</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008/8</td>
<td>Level 3 Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>1992-12</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009/8</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>1992-08</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010/8</td>
<td>IANA - Private Use</td>
<td>1995-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESERVED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011/8</td>
<td>DNS Inter Information Systems</td>
<td>1993-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012/8</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Bell Laboratories</td>
<td>1995-06</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013/8</td>
<td>Administered by ARIN</td>
<td>1991-09</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014/8</td>
<td>APNIC</td>
<td>2010-04</td>
<td>whois.apnic.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015/8</td>
<td>Hewlett-Packard Company</td>
<td>1994-07</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016/8</td>
<td>Digital Equipment Corporation</td>
<td>1994-11</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017/8</td>
<td>Apple Computer Inc.</td>
<td>1992-07</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018/8</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1994-01</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019/8</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>1995-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020/8</td>
<td>Computer Sciences Corporation</td>
<td>1994-10</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021/8</td>
<td>DON-RVN</td>
<td>1991-07</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022/8</td>
<td>Defense Information Systems Agency</td>
<td>1993-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023/8</td>
<td>ARIN</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024/8</td>
<td>ARIN</td>
<td>2001-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025/8</td>
<td>UK Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>1995-01</td>
<td>whois.ripe.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026/8</td>
<td>Defense Information Systems Agency</td>
<td>1995-05</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027/8</td>
<td>APNIC</td>
<td>2010-01</td>
<td>whois.apnic.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028/8</td>
<td>DSI-North</td>
<td>1992-07</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031/8</td>
<td>RIPE NCC</td>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>whois.ripe.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032/8</td>
<td>Administered by ARIN</td>
<td>1994-06</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033/8</td>
<td>DLA Systems Automation Center</td>
<td>1991-01</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034/8</td>
<td>Halliburton Company</td>
<td>1993-03</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035/8</td>
<td>Administered by ARIN</td>
<td>1994-04</td>
<td>whois.arin.net</td>
<td>LEGACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036/8</td>
<td>APNIC</td>
<td>2010-10</td>
<td>whois.apnic.net</td>
<td>ALLOCATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Root Zone Database

The Root Zone Database represents the delegation details of top-level domains, including gTLDs such as .com, and country-code TLDs such as .uk. As the manager of the DNS root zone, IANA is responsible for coordinating these delegations in accordance with its policies and procedures.

Much of this data is also available via the WHOIS protocol at whois.iana.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sponsoring Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.abb</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>ABB Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.abott</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Abbott Laboratories, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.abogado</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Top Level Domain Holdings Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ac</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Network Information Center (AC Domain Registry) c/o Cable and Wireless (Ascension Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.academy</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Half Oaks, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.accenture</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Accenture plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.accountant</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>dot Accountant Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.accountants</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Knob Town, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.active</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>The Active Network, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.actor</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>United TLD Holco Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ad</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Andorra Telecom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ads</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Charleston Road Registry Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.adult</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>ICM Registry AD LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ae</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Telecommunication Regulatory Authority (TRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.aeg</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Aktiebolaget Electrolux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.aero</td>
<td>sponsored</td>
<td>Societe Internationale de Telecommunications Aeronautique (SITA INC USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.af</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Ministry of Communications and IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.afl</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Australian Football League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ag</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>UHSA School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.agency</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Steel Falls, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ai</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Government of Anguilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.aig</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>American International Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.airforce</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>United TLD Holco Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.al</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Electronic and Postal Communications Authority - AKEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.allfinanz</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Allfinanz Deutsche Vermögensberatung Aktiengesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.alsace</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>REGION D ALSACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.an</td>
<td>country-code</td>
<td>Internet Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.amsterdam</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>Gemeente Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delegation Record for .MO

Sponsoring Organisation
Bureau of Telecommunications Regulation (DSRIT)
43 - 53A, Avenida do Infante D. Henrique, The Macau Square, 22/F
Macao

Administrative Contact
MONIC Administrative Contact
Macao Network Information Centre (MONIC) - HNET Asia
43 - 53A, Avenida do Infante D. Henrique, The Macau Square, 22/F, A
Macao
Email: hnet.asia-admin@monic.mo
Voice: +853 28716636
Fax: +853 28716606

Technical Contact
MONIC Technical Contact
Macao Network Information Centre (MONIC) - HNET Asia
43 - 53A, Avenida do Infante D. Henrique, The Macau Square, 22/F, A
Macao
Email: hnet.asia-tech@monic.mo
Voice: +853 28716636
Fax: +853 28716606

Name Servers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host Name</th>
<th>IP Address(es)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ns2.cuhk.edu.hk</td>
<td>137.189.6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.monic.mo</td>
<td>202.175.87.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.monic.mo</td>
<td>202.175.87.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.monic.mo</td>
<td>202.175.87.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.monic.mo</td>
<td>202.175.87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.monic.mo</td>
<td>202.175.87.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns17.cdns.net</td>
<td>194.6.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns17.cdns.net</td>
<td>2001:678:0:0:0:0:0:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns17.cdns.net</td>
<td>2001:678:0:0:0:0:0:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registry Information
URL for registration services: https://www.monic.mo
WHOIS Server: whois.monic.mo

IANA Reports
- Report on the Redelegation of the .MO domain representing Macao to the Bureau of Telecommunications Regulation (DSRIT) (2012-09-04)

“Stakeholder” refers broadly to anyone who has an interest in the Internet.

Within ICANN, stakeholders include:

- Large and small businesses
- Technical community
- Civil society
- Governments
- Researchers and academics
- End users

The multistakeholder community functions on bottom-up consensus building which, by design, is resistant to capture due to the openness, diversity and equal division of authority among participants.

ICANN’s private sector-led multi-stakeholder community supports the success of the Internet’s DNS.
Today’s Community of Communities

In the same way the Internet is a network of networks comprised of computers and devices, the ICANN community is a community of communities comprised of people and organizations.
ICANN’s Global Multistakeholder Community

- National governments
- Distinct economies recognized in international fora
- Multinational governmental and treaty organizations
- Public authorities (including UN agencies with a direct interest in global Internet Governance)
- Academic leaders
- Institutions of higher learning
- Professors
- Students
- Private-sector companies
- Trade associations
- Business
- Technical
- Internet Users
- Civil Society
- Government & Governmental Organizations
- Domain Name Industry
- Registries
- Registrars
- Domain organizations
- Non-governmental Organizations
- Non-profits
- Non-commercial Users
- Think Tanks
- Charities

- Protocol developers
- Equipment and software developers
- Network operators
- Technical researchers
The U.S. Government’s Announcement

14 March 2014: U.S. Government announces intent to transition its stewardship of the IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community

- Asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal
- The multistakeholder community has set policies implemented by ICANN for more than 15 years

The U.S. Government’s announcement:
- Marks the final phase of the privatization of the DNS
- Further supports and enhances the multistakeholder model of Internet policy making and governance

ICANN was asked to serve as a facilitator, based on its role as the IANA functions administrator and global coordinator for the Internet’s Domain Name System (DNS)
Why Does This Matter to Civil Society?

- Although the IANA functions are operational functions, they do require global governance and stewardship.
- The expertise from the non-governmental organization community is essential, especially due to:
  - Its **expertise** in holding governance entities accountable
  - Its **experience** in understanding and explaining public interest
  - Its **ability** to be innovative and propose solutions
- Your participation, and that of your networks, is critical in this evolution of Internet Governance to ensure excellence in the proposals and the legitimacy of the processes.
- This is a chance to strengthen an inclusive, transparent, global and collaborative model of governance that is fit for our present and future
Transition Requirements set by NTIA

NTIA has stated that the transition proposal must have broad community support and address the following four principles:

- Support and enhance the multistakeholder model
- Maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS
- Meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services
- Maintain the openness of the Internet

NTIA also specified that it will not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution.
The community developed and is following two parallel processes:

**IANA Stewardship Transition**
Focused on delivering a proposal to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions to the multistakeholder community.

**Enhancing ICANN Accountability**
Focused on ensuring that ICANN remains accountable in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Government.

To drive the processes, the community created multilayered, transparent and diverse working groups to foster discussion and within those groups, has developed working methods and systems for determining consensus.
Part of a Process

NTIA Announcement and Criteria

ICANN

ICG

ICG Proposal

Linkage

ICANN Board

NTIA

CWG Stewardship

CWG Proposal

CRISP

CRISP Proposal

IANAPLAN

IANAPLAN Proposal

CCWG Accountability

CCWG Proposal
Global Participation to Date

IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION & ENHANCING ICANN ACCOUNTABILITY

Two parallel processes, supported by a globally diverse, inclusive and extensive multistakeholder dialogue

MAJOR WORKING GROUP EFFORTS

- **447** Working Hours in Meetings
- **20,827** Total Mailing List Exchanges
- **246** Total Calls/Meetings

A SUPPORTING GLOBAL DISCUSSION

**282**
Events around the world where the IANA transition was discussed, debated, organized and planned
Between March 2014 and June 2015

ICANN + CCWG ACCOUNTABILITY

- **180** Total Participants
- **154** Members
- **49** Mailing List Observers

THE TWO PARALLEL PROCESSES

- IANA Stewardship Transition
- Enhancing ICANN Accountability for the Transition

2015 | ICANN | For more information, please visit www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability.
IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION
IANA Stewardship Transition Process

1 Establishment of a Coordination Group

- Has representation from all stakeholders
- The community self-selected its members
- Established its own working methods and modes of operation
- Was encouraged to adhere to diversity standards
- Supported by an independent, non-ICANN staff secretariat

2 ICANN serves as a convener and facilitator of the

- Provides engagement and outreach, travel and additional support services
The IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) was formed in July 2014 to assemble and deliver a proposal to NTIA through the ICANN Board

- The ICG is made up of 30 individuals representing 13 communities of both direct and indirect stakeholders of the IANA functions
- The ICG’s responsibilities include:

  Act as a **liaison** to all interested parties, including the three operational communities of the IANA functions

  Assess the outputs of the three operational communities for **compatibility** and **interoperability**

  **Assemble** a complete proposal for the transition

  **Information sharing** and public communication
ICG RFP Required Proposal Elements

1. Description of community’s use of IANA functions

2. A description of the function
   - A description of the customer(s) of the function
   - What registries are involved in providing the function
   - A description of any overlaps or interdependencies between that community’s IANA requirements and the functions required by other customer communities

3. Existing, Pre-Transition arrangements
   - Policy sources
   - Oversight and accountability

4. Proposed Post-Transition oversight and accountability arrangements

5. Transition implications
Request for Transition Proposal Structure

**Domain Names:**
Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions (**CWG-Stewardship**)

**Number Resources:**
Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal Team (**CRISP Team**)

**Protocol Parameters:**
IANAPLAN Working Group (**IANAPLAN WG**)
The Domain Names community developed a **Cross Community Working Group (CWG-Stewardship)** to produce a consolidated transition proposal for the elements of the IANA Functions relating to the Domain Name System.

**Finalized a Second Draft Proposal:**

- **Operational:** the CWG-Stewardship shifted into expertise-based subgroups to produce the operational parts of the proposal.
  - There were 15 ‘Design Teams’ proposed (one on escalation mechanisms, one on reviews, etc.)

- **Structural:** the group, with assistance from independent legal counsel, considered 7 alternative structural models not fully considered in the first draft proposal

**Submitted its response to the ICG RFP on 25 June 2015**
Linkage & Coordination with CCWG-Accountability

1. ICANN Budget
   Community rights regarding development and consideration

2. ICANN Board
   Community rights, specifically to appoint/remove members, recall entire Board

3. IANA Function Review
   Incorporated into the bylaws

4. Customer Standing Committee (CSC)
   Incorporated into the bylaws

5. Appeals Mechanism
   Independent Review Panel should be made applicable to IANA Functions and accessible by TLD managers

6. Fundamental bylaws
   All foregoing mechanisms are to be provided for in the bylaws as “fundamental bylaws”

The CWG-Stewardship’s proposal is expressly conditioned upon the outcomes of the CCWG-Accountability.
The five Regional Internet address Registries (RIRs) engaged in community consultations in their respective regions from September to November 2014.

The Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal Team (CRISP Team) was developed to coordinate the production of a response to the RFP based these consultations.

- 15 members, 3 from each RIR community

Submitted its response to the ICG RFP on 15 January 2015.
Established an **IANAPLAN Working Group** to develop its response to the RFP
- Adopted an Internet Draft as a basis for developing a response
- Underwent IETF last call, and IESG approval
- A total of **10** drafts were produced over 9 months

✅ Submitted its response to the ICG RFP on 6 January 2015
Next Steps for the ICG

Following receipt of the Domain Names Community Proposal during the ICANN53 Meeting in Buenos Aires, the group is now assessing the combined proposals.

Next Steps:

- **Assess the Combined Proposals**
  Assess the outputs of the three operational communities for compatibility and interoperability

- **Refine Interim Final Proposal**
  Refine an Interim Final Proposal following assessment

- **Launch Public Comment Period on Interim Final Proposal**
  40-day public comment on Interim Final Proposal to gather community input
ENHANCING ICANN ACCOUNTABILITY
As initial discussions around the transition took place, the community raised the broader topic of the impact of the change on ICANN’s accountability.

- The transition would end the U.S. Government’s historical contractual relationship with ICANN.
- This relationship has been perceived as a backstop with regard to ICANN’s organization-wide accountability.

ICANN launched a second process, parallel but interrelated with the IANA Stewardship Transition process, to examine from an organizational perspective how ICANN’s broader accountability mechanisms should be strengthened to address the absence of the U.S. Government.
Enhancing ICANN Accountability Elements

1 Establishment of a Cross Community Working Group

2 Scope of accountability work has two Work Streams

- **Work Stream 1**: Focused mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA Stewardship Transition

- **Work Stream 2**: Focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition

3 Involvement of external Advisors

- The Public Experts Group selected 7 Advisors to provide external expertise and best practices to help contribute to the dialogue

- These advisors do not participate in calls for consensus

4 Role of the ICANN Board

- Will consider the outputs from Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2, on receiving the proposals will forward them promptly and without modification to NTIA

- A Board liaison is involved in discussions robustly, bringing the voice and experience of the Board into the development of recommendations
Existing ICANN Accountability Mechanisms

1. Affirmation of Commitments
2. Affirmation of Commitments Reviews
3. Bylaws
4. Bylaws-Mandated Redress Mechanism
5. Documentation for Board of Directors
6. Documented Relationships
7. External Laws
8. General ICANN Operational Information
9. ICANN Board Selection Process
10. Organizational Reviews
The CCWG-Accountability has two Work Streams:

**Work Stream 1**
Focused on mechanisms enhancing ICANN-Accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA Stewardship Transition.

**Work Stream 2**
Focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

**Goal:**
Deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN’s accountability towards all stakeholders.
Working Parties

Work Party 1 – Community Empowerment

- Considering **powers** for the community to hold ICANN accountable
- Develop appropriate **mechanisms** to allow the community to exercise those powers

Work Party 2 – Review and Redress

- Considering enhancements to ICANN’s existing accountability, new mechanisms and the creation of a **standard for review and redress**
  - Develop a standard against which ICANN’s actions are evaluated

ST Work Party – Stress Tests Work Party

- Developed a list of **risks** and a methodology for stress testing
Four Building Blocks

**Empowered Community**
Refers to the powers that allow the community i.e. the people to take action should ICANN breach the principles.

**ICANN Board**
Represents the executive entity the community may act against, as appropriate.

**Principles Form the Mission**
Guarantees and core values of the organization i.e. the Constitution.

**Independent Review Mechanisms**
i.e. the judiciary, confers the power to review and provide redress, as needed.
What Can I Do Now To Get Involved?

Join a working group
- CCWG-Accountability, contact accountability-staff@icann.org

Participate in a public comment period
Participating in public comment periods is an integral part of ICANN’s inclusive and bottom-up model of proposal development

Stay up to date on recent developments
- Visit: https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability
- Follow @ICANN on Twitter or like ICANN on Facebook
- Subscribe to ICANN news alerts
Thank You and Questions

Website: https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability

Questions?

IANA Stewardship Transition

https://www.icann.org/stewardship
- Latest news and information on the IANA Stewardship Transition and ICG
- Community participation information
- Resources and archives from ICG meetings

Enhancing ICANN Accountability

https://community.icann.org/category/accountability
- Latest news and information on theEnhancing ICANN Accountability process and CCWG
- Announcements and upcoming events